

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-138 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Office Action dated January 27, 2005, claims 1-8, 10-19, 21, 23-41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 51, 52, 55-62, 64, 67-71, 73-81, 83, 87-110, 112-119, 121-129 and 134-138 were allowed, and claims 9, 20, 22, 42, 43, 46, 49, 50, 53, 54, 63, 65, 66, 72, 84-86, 111, 120 and 130-133 were rejected. Applicant thanks Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application. Applicant also thanks Examiner for the Examiner Interview on March 1, 2005. The substance of that interview is incorporated in this Amendment and Response as required by MPEP § 713.04.

No claims are amended herein. Claims 9, 20, 22, 46, 49, 50, 53, 54, 63, 65, 66, 72, 82, 84-86, 111, 120 and 131-133 are canceled. Claims 139-170 are added. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The claims have been amended to expedite the prosecution of the application in a manner consistent with the Patent Office Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (Sept. 8, 2000). In making these amendments, Applicant has not and does not narrow the scope of the protection to which Applicant considers the claimed invention to be entitled and does not concede that the subject matter of such claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicant reserves the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e)**

In 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 20, 22, 42, 43, 49, 50, 53, 63, 65, 66, 82, 84-86, and 130-133 under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,072,537 to Gurner et al. ("Gurner"). This rejection is now obviated in view of these claims being canceled. As noted above, Applicants do not acquiesce that these claims are anticipated in view of this cancellation. Moreover, in some instances, the claims have been appropriately broadened, e.g., reciting a recording medium for storing images and thereafter reciting exemplary features such as tapes or disks as a recording medium.

As for claims 42 and 43, support for these claims is found in the parent application, hence, obviating the basis of the rejection in view of Gurner. For example, page 8, line 5 through page 9, line 1 discloses how based on keying certain parts of a signal pass through multiplexer 142, which results may include saturation of a particular color. Likewise, the Y signal (luminance) can be altered based on what is keyed and what is passed by multiplexer 142.

As for claim 130, support for this claim is also found in the parent specification, hence, also obviating the basis for the rejection to this claim in view of Gurner. For example, page 5, lines 14-18 and lines 31-33 describe external devices that can allow viewing of the video signal such as a monitor and a display, which are devices recited in claim 130.

Thus for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that basis for the rejections to claims 20, 22, 42, 43, 49, 50, 53, 63, 65, 66, 82, 84-86, and 130-133 have now been obviated. Applicant requests consideration and allowance of the presently remaining claims.

Based on the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claims 20, 22, 42, 43, 49, 50, 53, 63, 65, 66, 82, 84-86, and 130-133 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

**Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Gurner**

In the 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 9, 46, 54, 72, 111 and 120 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Gurner. This rejection is now obviated in view of these claims being canceled. As noted above, Applicants do not acquiesce that these claims are anticipated in view of this cancellation. Moreover, in some instances, the claims have been appropriately broadened, e.g., reciting a recording medium for storing images and thereafter reciting exemplary features such as tapes or disks as a recording medium.

Applicant has added new claims 139 through 170 for which Applicant requests consideration and examination. Applicant respectfully submits that these are supported by the specification and are commensurate within the scope of protection to which Applicant believes they are entitled.

**Conclusion**

In sum, claims 1-8, 10-19, 21, 23-45, 47, 48, 51, 52, 55-62, 64, 67-71, 73-81, 83, 87-110, 112-119, and 121-130 remain in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 134-170, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Applicant requests allowance of these claims.

In addition, Applicant respectfully invites Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
David Green

Date: April 21, 2005

By:



Rajiv P. Patel, Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 39,327  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7607  
Fax: (650) 938-5200  
E-Mail: rpatel@fenwick.com